

Remarks

In this amendment, claims 1-16 are pending. The claims have been amended to correct some typographical errors and to simplify them so that novel features can be more easily identified. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the detailed review and consideration evidenced in the January 25, 2005 Office Action.

Specification

In the specification, the paragraph on page 2 starting at line 24 and ending on line 26, which the Examiner stated "improperly referred to the claims" has been deleted. On page 4, line 18 a sentence was added for clarification. The administrative error that gave more than one part name to the same reference number has been corrected by changing the references for "drive 16" to "drive 25" on pages 6, 7 and 9, and on page 7, line 1 the "push-in station 16" has been changed to "push-in arrangement 16".

A typographical error, relating to the Examiner's rejection for indefiniteness, has been corrected by replacing the word "active" with the word "inactive" and the word "inactive" with the word "active" on page 6, line 9.

Drawings

Reference Character

The Examiner objected to the reference character 16 being used both for "the push-in arrangement" and "the drive." This administrative error has been corrected by renumbering "the drive" as reference number 25 in the figures, and changing the specification accordingly. In the Replacement Sheets attached herewith, these informalities have been corrected and this objection may be withdrawn.

Showing claimed features in the drawing

For a number of claims the examiner objected to certain recitations because allegedly the features were not shown in the drawings. Responses for individual claims are as follows.

Claims 1, 2, 3. The Examiner objected to a recitation in claims 1-3 because the features were not depicted in the drawings. As part of the simplification of the claims, the applicants have eliminated the objected language, and these objections may be withdrawn.

Claim 7. The Examiner objected to the recitation of the envelope-flap-opening device in claim 7. Applicant has amended the specification to clarify that it is known in the art that the envelope-separating-arrangement 6 may include a flap opening device. It is submitted that the figures adequately show the arrangement 6, and that this objection may be withdrawn.

Claim 9. The Examiner objected to references to abutment means and abutment plate. Applicants refer the examiners to reference numbers 5, 7, and 7a in Fig. 1. As further supported by the specification at page 9, line 30, to page 10, line 15, it can be seen that these features of claim 9 are adequately depicted, and the objection may be withdrawn.

Claim 10. Claim 10 has been amended to recite that the intermediate conveying device conveys the perforated belts. This feature is clearly depicted in Figs. 4 and 5 and this objection may be withdrawn.

§112 Rejections

Claims 1-16 were rejected as being indefinite. Applicant has amended the claims to overcome these rejections, primarily by removing the alleged indefinite language. With regard to claim 1, lines 40-44, and the confusion about "active" and "inactive," Applicant has amended the specification at page 6, line 9, to correct the typographical error in the specification. The claims and specification are now consistent on the use of those terms. With regard to claim 9, Applicant refers the Examiner to reference numbers 5, 7, and 7a in Fig. 1. As further supported by the

specification at page 9, line 30, to page 10, line 15, it can be seen that these features of claim 9 are adequately depicted and described in connection with the envelope-conveying device, and the rejection may be withdrawn.

§103 Rejections

Claims 1-6, 10 and 13-16 stand rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,164,046 to Werner et al. ("Werner") in view of U.S. Patent 5,180,154 to Malick ("Malick") and U.S. Patent 5,447,015 to Belec ("Belec").

Werner represents an arrangement of inserter machine, such as described in the background of the present application, that the present invention seeks to improve upon. One novel improvement of the present invention over Werner is the inclusion of the angled "intermediate envelope-conveying device" to bring envelopes from the envelope stack to the push in arrangement, and to stop the envelope at the push-in arrangement for filling of the envelope, before allowing the envelope to continue on.

The Malick reference has been asserted because it shows a device for conveying envelopes diagonally while undergoing a 90 degree change of direction. However, the diagonal 90 degree turn in Malick does not depict any mechanism for stopping the envelope within the angled transport to allow filling of an envelope. Applicant submits that stopping the envelope in the diagonal transport is not described or suggested by either of the Werner or Malick references, alone, or taken together.

In claim 1, a novel feature of using the diagonal transport for stopping the envelope at the push-in arrangement requires "an angled stop arrangement" that includes three positions: "active," "inactive," and "an intermediate stop position." None of the asserted references describe a stop having all three positions. The Examiner has asserted Belec as describing a moving back-stop 50 for an insertion device. Belec fails to describe or suggest, however, any "intermediate stop position." The "intermediate stop position" is part of the novel arrangement that

allows the combination including the diagonal transport to provide envelopes to the push-in-arrangement.

The Belec reference depicts an insertion device where the envelope transport and the enclosure transport are in line with each other. Accordingly, there is no suggestion to combine the back-stop 50 of Belec with either of the Werner or Malick references. As mentioned above, none of these asserted references include a description or suggestion of a stop with “an intermediate stop position.” Accordingly, these rejections of claim 1, and its dependent claims, should be withdrawn because there are features not described in any of the asserted references, and because there is no suggestion to combine the asserted references to form the claimed invention.

Claims 7, 8, and 11 stand rejected in view of the Werner, Malick, and Belec references in further view of U.S. Patent 5,950,399 to Viens, et al. (“Viens”). Viens is asserted for its description of a envelope flap opening device. However, Viens does not cure the deficiencies as described above with regard to claim 1. Accordingly, these rejections should be withdrawn for the same reasons.

Claims 9 and 12 stand rejected in view of the Werner, Malick, and Belec references in further view of U.S. Patent 6,102,391 to Malick, et al. (“Malick2”). Malick2 is asserted for its description of abutment features and spherical rolling bodies. However, Malick2 does not cure the deficiencies as described above with regard to claim 1. Accordingly, these rejections should be withdrawn for the same reasons.

Conclusion

All issues having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted this application is in a condition for allowance. Please contact the undersigned representative if there are any questions regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Cummings
Reg. No. 46,650
Attorney of Record
Telephone (203) 924-3934

PITNEY BOWES INC.
Intellectual Property and
Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive
P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484-8000